

REMARKS

Applicant amended Claims 1-5, cancelled Claims 6-8 and added new Claims 9-23. The amendments and new claims remove multiple dependent claims depending from multiple dependent claims. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to Claim 6 as being in improper form. Claim 6 has been cancelled and all multiple dependencies removed in the new claims presented, rendering this rejection moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the examiner inquired about the use of the term “neutralize” when adjusting the pH to greater than 7.0. Although the term is generally understood in the art as it is used in the specification, the claims have been amended, rendering this rejection moot.

Applicant maintains that the claims are patentable in view of the amendments and arguments presented above. Applicant’s attorney thanks the Examiner for the time taken to review this response. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the attorney listed below if there are any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,



Karl Stauss
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,827
Telephone (215) 592-3436

Rohm and Haas Company
100 Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2399